REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 15, 18-19, and 23-24 remain in this application. Claims 2, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 20-22 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 13, and 19 have been amended. New claims 25 and 26 have been added. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 13-19, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Cheline et al. (7,197,550). Applicant respectfully urges reconsideration of the outstanding rejections. Specifically, neither Cheline nor any art of record discloses a system for relocating network subnets using a tunnel configured to traverse a NAT from encumbering communication between the network and the relocated network subnet.

Claims 1, 13, 19

Amended claim 1 now recites that the "tunnel is configured to traverse a NAT from encumbering communication between the network subnet and the relocated network subnet". The examiner rejected dependent claims 6 and 7 (containing these limitations and now incorporated into amended claim 1) on the grounds that "Cheline teaches that the tunnel is configured to traverse a mechanism that encumbers communication" and that "the mechanism that encumbers communication comprises a NAT." Office Action ("OA") at p. 4 ¶¶ 14-15. The Examiner cites to Cheline column 6, line 60 – column 8 line 50 and column 12, lines 10-20 in support. OA at p. 4 ¶¶ 14-15. Neither of the cited passages, however, discusses the NAT, which is referenced, for example, in Cheline column 8, lines 61-62 and column 9, lines 30-49. The

NAT as disclosed in Cheline, which resides in modem 106 (FIG. 2), is used in a wholly different

manner from that contemplated by the present invention.

    With reference to the role of the NAT, Cheline states:

> NAT maps the LAN IP address to one or more global IP addresses and unmaps
> the global IP addresses of incoming packets back into LAN IP addresses. This
> helps ensure security since each outgoing or incoming request must go through a
> translation process that also offers the opportunity to qualify or authenticate the
> request or match it to a previous request. NAT also conserves on the number of
> global IP addresses used by the modem 106.

Colum 9, lines 34-42. Thus, by performing translations, ensuring security, and conserving global

IP addresses, the NAT in Cheline represents a cooperative service of the modem 106. By

contrast, the present invention, per amended claim 1, solves the problems that occur when the

NAT is configured as a non-cooperative mechanism that otherwise hinders remote

communication. For this reason the NAT in Cheline is not analogous to the NAT as disclosed in

the present invention.

    An example of this is shown in applicant's Figure 11. The present invention uniquely

recognizes that the tunnel 87 between the anchor and the tether can be used to traverse the NAT

82 and thereby avoid the restrictions imposed by the NAT mechanism. Because Cheline fails to

disclose or even suggest that the functionality of a NAT can be undesirable in specific

networking applications as described by applicant, one skilled in the art could not rely on the

teachings of Cheline to develop a system for bypassing a non-cooperative NAT to establish the

remote subnet. In fact, because Cheline discloses how to configure a cooperative mechanism

rather than how to circumvent a non-cooperative one, it would not have been obvious to modify

Cheline to produce a result in response to a problem not recognized by Cheline in the first place.

In short, Cheline fails to disclose the limitation of amended claim 1 of "establishing a tunnel ... <u>wherein the tunnel is configured to traverse a NAT from encumbering communication between the network subnet and the relocated network subnet</u>." Applicant respectfully requests allowance of amended claim 1.

Independent claims 13 and 19 contain similar limitations. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully requests allowance of amended claims 13 and 19.

<u>Claims 3-5, 8-11, 15, 18</u>

Claims 3-5, 8-12, 15, and 18 are now dependent on allowable base claims. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cheline in view of Das et al. (6,992,994). In light of the arguments above with respect to independent claim 1, the rejections of dependent claims 12, 23 and 24 are respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendment places this application in condition for allowance, which Applicant respectfully solicits.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 501946 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account and reference attorney docket no. 28080-107.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Marc E. Brown
Registration No. 28,590

2049 Century Park East, 38th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 277-4110
Facsimile: (310) 277-4730

Please recognize our Customer No. 33401 as our correspondence address.

Date: April 23, 2008

LAS99 1548183-1.028080.0107